

PROPOSAL EVALUATION
IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	County	Colusa, Lake, Napa, Yolo, Solano
Project Title	Westside RWMG IRWMP	Grant Request	\$1,000,000
		Total Project Cost	\$1,586,800

Project Description The Westside RWMG plans to create a Westside IRWMP that will serve as the planning document for all regional water projects in the Putah or Cache Creek watersheds. Useful planning information already included in adopted IRWMPs, such as the Yolo County IRWMP, Solano Agencies IRWMP, and Sacramento Valley IRWMP will be utilized to create the Westside IRWMP.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	10
Budget	6
Program Preferences	4
Geographic Balance	0
Total Score	42

- **Work Plan** The work plan is complete but is not fully supported. The work items include appropriate task submittals, such as quarterly and final status reports. While the work items collectively implement the proposal, it lacks detail and completeness in terms of documentation and rationale. For example, Task 3a, which includes a reference to an MOU between the regional public agencies, provides inadequate detail on how diverse water management issues across the region will be integrated in the IRWMP. There is only a brief discussion regarding regional conflicts and priorities and how the IRWMP regional group will resolve any conflicts that arise.
- **DAC Involvement** The work plan provides tasks for and clearly shows the process the applicant will use to facilitate and support DACs within the IRWM region. The work plan demonstrated collaboration with DACs and provided information and support documentation about DAC involvement. The work plan outlines the process for identifying DACs and inviting those DACs to all stakeholder meetings, as well as holding additional focused meeting in DACs. The plan includes details regarding outreach to DACs such as outreach through public notices in local papers, and providing printed and electronic materials in English and Spanish. Identification of and outreach to tribes is also discussed in the Work Plan in similar detail to DACs.
- **Schedule** The schedule is consistent and reasonable. It is very detailed and easy to follow. The schedule corresponds to the work plan tasks. It seems reasonable for the work proposed.
- **Budget** In the budget not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking. The detailed budget did not include number of meetings; or assumed number of persons attending (level/role) – there were lumped hours and lumped hourly rates and no quantities. The blended hourly rate should be supported in the narrative. The detailed budget should break down hours per task by position (e.g. GIS Analyst, Engineer, Project Manager, etc).
- **Program Preference** Four program preferences (Inclusion of regional projects/programs, Effectively integrate water management programs, Effectively integrate water management and land use planning, Climate change response actions) were adequately addressed.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable